DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 280 HE 011 819

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Kiernan, Stephen J., Comp. |
| TITLE | The Role of the College/University in the Preparation and Development of Educators: A Challenge for the 80's. PROJECT UPDATE. Fall 1978 Conference. |
| INSTITUTION | New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 78 |
| GRANT | PR-451-90029 |
| NOTE | 49p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Project Update, 168 Bank Street, Hightstown, NJ 08520 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Role; Continuous Learning; *Educational Development; Evaluation; *Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Professional Continuing Education; Professional Education; State Colleges; *Teacher Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | New Jersey; *Project Update |

ABSTRACT

A compendium of a conference on the role of the college/university in the preparation and development of educators sponsored by Project Update, a program of continuing professional development for faculty members at institutions of higher learning in New Jersey, is presented. The conference agenda and the participants are listed, followed by texts of the keynote presentations by Seymour Sarason, Professor of Psychology at Yale University, and T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education for the State of New Jersey. Sarason describes factors causing society's malaise and suggests areas of growth for higher education, such as lifelong learning. Hollander suggests that teacher training is an area in need of improvement and stresses the importance of continuing education. A summary of small group reports is provided and reactions from the following six observers are included: Grace Bingham, Assistant Professor, Rutgers University; Mark Chamberlain, President, Glassboro State College; George Daniel, Superintendent, Bound Brook County; Marianne Schneider, Teacher, Washington Township; Bruce Waldman, Dean, Jersey City State College; and Charles Yates, Senator. Text of a dialogue between the keynote speakers is provided. Observers felt that the conference was important and expressed some difficulty with the small groups in terms of clarity of direction and defensiveness on the part of some participants. The conference evaluation form and a brief summary of the evaluation, including strongest and weakest aspects, suggestions, and post meeting reactions are included. (PHR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED180280

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. J. Dept of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE

# A CHALLENGE FOR THE 80's

FALL 1978
CONFERENCE

## THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY IN THE PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATORS

HE 011 814

PROJECT UPDATE

Branch of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services
Division of School Programs
New Jersey State Department of Education

PROJECT UPDATE

A FALL CONFERENCE

DECEMBER 19, 1978

# THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY IN THE PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATORS: A CHALLENGE FOR THE 80'S


Project Staff:
William K. Friedel
Project Director
Barbara T. Nadler, Ed.D.
Project Coordinator
Stephen J. Kiernan
Doctoral Intern

Project Update
168 Bank Street
Hightstown, New Jersey 08520

609-448-0932



Compendium Prepared By:
Stephen J. Kiernan
Cover Designed By:
Eric Darling



This report was developed pursuant to Special Education Personnel Preparation Grant PR451-90029 awarded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the New Jersey State Department of Education. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the granting agency.

## PREFACE

Project Update is a program of continuing professional development for faculty members in special education at institutions of higher learning in the State of New Jersey. The Project represents a cooperative effort between the member institutions of the Higher Education Council for Special Education and the State Department of Education. Project activities are funded through a grant awarded to the New Jersey State Department of Education from the Bureau of the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education. The intent of Project Update is to enhance the quality of service provided to the handicapped by strengthening the personnel preparation programs within the state's institutions of higher education.

On December 19, 1978, the Project sponsored a conference, "The Role of the College/University in the Preparation and Development of Educators/A Challenge for the 80's." This conference was a step toward translating and applying the expertise within colleges of education to the practical problems confronting the public school system. Today's pressures of declining enrollment, diminishing resources and increasing demands for accountability suggest that the time for action is now.

This Compendium includes the results of the conference experience. It is our hope that the ideas and thoughts exchanged and generated from the day's activities will provide a foundation for continuing dialogue, collaboration and action. Success in this effort will be measured by our ability to meet challenges, both present and future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Conference Agenda | 5 |
| Conference Participants | 7 |
| Keynote Presentations | 9 |
| Dr. Seymour Sarason, Professor of Psychology, Yale University | 11 |
| Dr. T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education, The State of New Jersey | 17 |
| Conference Reactions | 23 |
| Summary of Small Group Reports | 25 |
| Observer Reactions | 29 |
| Grace Bingham, Assistant Professor, Rutgers University | 31 |
| Mark Chamberlain, President, Glassboro State College | 35 |
| George Daniel, Superintendent, Bound Brook | 41 |
| Marianne Schmieder, Teacher, Washington Township | 43 |
| Bruce Waldman, Dean, Jersey City State College | 45 |
| Charles B. Yates, Senator, New Jersey District #7 | 47 |
| Dialogue Between Dr. Hollander and Dr. Sarason | 49 |
| Conference Evaluation | 57 |
| Acknowledgements | 63 |

## CONFERENCE AGENDA

THEME: The Role of the College/University in the Preparation and Development of Educators - A Challenge for the 80's.

8:30 - 9:00 Coffee and Orientation

9:00 - 9:15 Introductory Statements and Introduction of Speakers - William K. Friedel, Project Director

9:15 - 9:45 Seymour Sarason, Professor, Yale University

9:50 - 10:20 T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education for the State of New Jersey

10:20 - 10:40 Break/Movement into Groups.

10:40 - 11:25 Reaction/Recommendation Groups

Facilitators -
Dr. Patricia Brady - Coordinator, School Psychologists, Branch of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services

Dr. Spencer Gibbins - Assistant Professor, Rutgers - Graduate School of Education

Mr. Charles Lagos - Passaic County Supervisor of Child Study

Dr. Myrna Merron - Assistant Professor, Seton Hall University

Dr. James Richardson - Director, Bureau of Special Education

Dr. Kenneth Schneider - Assistant Professor, Rutgers - Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology

The remainder of the conference will be facilitated by -
Dr. Barbara Nadler, Project Coordinator

11:35 - 12:05 FISHBOWL I - Group Representatives

12:10 - 12:40 FISHBOWL II - Conference Reactors -

Dr. Grace Bingham - Assistant Professor, Rutgers - Graduate School of Education

Dr. Mark Chamberlain - President, Glassboro State College

Dr. George H. Daniel - Superintendent of Schools, Bound Brook

Miss Marianne Schmieder - Special Education Teacher,
Washington Township

Dr. Bruce Waldman - Dean, School of Professional Studies and
Education, Jersey City State College

Honorable Charles B. Yates - New Jersey State Senator, District 7

12:40 - 1:10 Reactions - Dr. Hollander and Dr. Sarason

1:10 - 1:15 Post Meeting Reaction

1:15 - Lunch

## CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:
T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education
The State of New Jersey
Seymour Sarason, Professor of Psychology, Yale University

OBSERVERS:
Grace Bingham, Assistant Professor, Rutgers - Graduate School of Education
Mark Chamberlain, President, Glassboro State College
George Daniel, Superintendent of Schools, Bound Brook, New Jersey
Marianne Schmieder, Special Education Teacher, Washington Township
Bruce Waldman, Dean, School of Professional Studies and Education, Jersey City State College
Charles Yates, New Jersey State Senate, District 7

FACILITATORS:
Patricia Brady, Coordinator, School Psychologists, Branch of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services
Spencer Gibbins, Assistant Professor, Rutgers-Graduate School of Education
Charles Lagos, Passaic County Supervisor of Child Study
Myrna Merron, Assistant Professor, Seton Hall University
James Richardson, Director, Bureau of Special Education
Kenneth Schneider, Assistant Professor, Rutgers-GSAPP

GUESTS:

Douglass College -

Norma Goetz
Maryann Peins
Fay A. Yeager

Fairleigh Dickinson University -

Rita D. Fass
Lewis Jacobs

Felician College -

Sr. Christyn Marie Fodor
Nancy Herink
Sr. Annelle Velivis

Glassboro State College -

Marion Bickley
Norman R. Haremeister
Stanley Urban

Gloucester County College -

Berminna Solem

Jersey City State College -

Chelly Gutin
Catherine Hamalian
Vern McGriff
Ruth S. Pachtman
George Voller

Kean College of New Jersey -

Georgiana Appagnani
Frank E. Bachkai
Bryna S. Berson
Harry N. Dubin
Elaine B. Fisher
Kathryn A. Gasorek
Madelyn M. Healy
Richard Nicolaus
Janet G. Prince
Ruth E. Ward
Joyce P. Warshow

Monmouth College -

Jerome Margolis
Nelson Moses
Robert Rouse
Charles W. Rutledge
Ruth West

Montclair State College -

Mae Balaban
Walter Duryea
Harold M. Scholl
Antoinette Spiotta
George Westmoreland

New Jersey State Department of Education -

Joyce Boose
Tom Brown
Vincentz Cianci
Dennis Connors
Alease Cooke
Eleanor Engelbrecht
Katie Gibson
Robert Gray
Dan Kunz
Ellen Maney
Margeret Mitchell
Geraldine Parham
Carol Scelza
Robert Shanberg
Jackie Stefkovich
Janice Swack
Paul Winkler

New Jersey State Department of Higher Education -

Leo Klagholtz
Carol Paul

Rutgers University-Graduate School of Education

Ivan Holowinsky
Mary Santopietro

Rutgers College -

S. John Vitello

Rutgers University-Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology

Christopher Barbrack
Virginia Bennett
Edward Docherty
Elizabeth Henry
Milton Schwebel

Seton Hall University -

Elizabeth J. Beck
John H. Callan
Myrna Wasserman

Trenton State College -

Margaret Mayer

William Paterson State College -

Jeffrey Pollack
Louis Stoia
Myron Swack

KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Seymour Sarason, Professor of Psychology, Yale University

Dr. T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education, The State of New Jersey

facilitate this sense of personal growth. The sense of personal growth has had many, many consequences. One of them I want to mention here, because I think it is relevant to the theme of today. It is what I call the maladaptiveness of the one life, one career imperative. The one life, one career imperative can be put very briefly; society says to us, here is a smorgasbord of opportunities, choose the one you would like to work at for the rest of your life. You can be either A, B, C, or D; you cannot be A, B, C, and D, you must choose. The one life, one career imperative was on a collision course with personal growth as a criterion for judging one's life. We are now beginning to be aware of career change and the ways in which people no longer want to remain in the role that they have been in, not that they are necessarily dissatisfied, not because they have not accomplished in that role, but simply that they have lost that sense of excitment, that sense of growth without which they feel life is not worthwhile. When we talk about redirecting our energy as individuals or as an institution or a system of institutions, I think unless we pay attention to this need for personal growth, this need to be able to move in new directions, we will have missed one of the most important things that is in the minds of people today. Now, let me get more specific.

It has always been true that there has been a felt discrepancy between the realities of public education and the traditions, organizations, and practices of our training centers for people going into the field of education. Somehow, there was a schism and gulf between the realities of school and the preparation of people to meet those realities. Although that has always been true, it never really came on to the social agenda until the fifties and the sixties, and it came on the social agenda not because we wanted it, but largely because of court decisions. We were being forced to ponder, and to do something about, the gulf between the realities of education and the nature of programs preparing people to enter education. Just let me give you two examples of what I mean by that. Back in 1960 or 1961, Burton Blatt, Ken Davidson, and I wrote a little book called The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education. The book went out of print in an amazingly short time, it was as though it has never been written. The point, we were making in that book, was that the training of education personnel had little to do with the realities of the situation in which educational personnel were to be put. I would say that this really was an unstudied problem which struck people as odd in the extreme but those were the days, back in the early 60's, when, far from wanting to extend or change the nature of teacher training, the aim was how quickly could you put human beings into a classroom. So, our book had no impact at all and it has long been forgotten. One of the things we pointed out in that book was that there is one function that all teachers must perform, do perform, for which they get not five seconds of exposure in their preparation, and that is, how do you talk to parents. Now, unless you believe that this a God given gift, then obviously, we are not dealing with an important issue here. The fact of the matter is that the Cold War didn't originate in Europe, it orignated between parents and schools and it has been going on for a very long time. It didn't become an overt problem again until the 50's and 60's when everything else was happening in our society. The fact of the matter is we have done practically nothing about this problem. I have looked over teacher training programs in all parts of the country and I have yet to see one that takes seriously this question, how do you talk to parents? We brought this up in the context of how do you talk to parents whose children are going to be put in special classes. Remember this was back in the early

sixties when special classes were being set up almost by the minute; in fact, there were classes for the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed, perceptually handicapped, you name it and we had a class for them. The only thing that dissatisfied us was there was not enough of them. Let me give you another example of this gap. There is one thing that the school administrators do with great frequency; they participate in meetings, they either arrange for meetings or sit in meetings. How do we help school administrators think about meetings? As most of you know, man's inhumanity to man is best illustrated in either faculty meetings or other kinds of meetings. (Incidentaly, this is by no means peculiar to the field of public education. Those of you who have not sat in on faculty meetings in universities shouldn't feel cheated.) But the fact is that the two instances that I gave, one in relation to teachers, and one in relation to administrators, explains in part why, when the whole business of the relationship of schools to communities arose, the schools were ill-prepared to deal with those issues.

Another way of putting this gap between teacher preparation (or the preparation of educational personnel) and the classroom, (and here, pardon me, I am scapegoating my own profession, the psychologist) I put in this way: if Thordike had put two rats in the maze instead of putting one, we would have had a far more useable theory of learning in social psychology than we have. What American teachers have been brought up on is a psychology of the individual. The fact of the matter is that teachers are never dealing with individuals, they are always dealing with individuals in a group context. And yet, so much of the preparation of teachers is from the standpoint of individuals. Now, more germane to the theme of this conference, we have been brought up to believe that there are two theories of learning, one for "regular" children and one for "non regular" children. This is as justifiable, makes as much sense, as if you were to say that you need a special theory for the helium atom and a special theory for the oxygen atom. We wanted to believe that in fact we needed two psychologies, one to deal with the regular and one to deal with the irregular children. The fact of the matter is that we don't need two psychologies. We wanted to believe that we needed two psychologies, that whatever principles of learning, of educating that have held up over the century are no less applicable to one group hen they are to another.

In regard to mainstreaming, and I am one who has long advocated mainstreaming, I must be honest with you and tell you that, when I have moved around the country looking at the implementation of mainstreaming, I have no cause for enthusiasum. What I see is further proof of the maxim that the more things change the more they remain the same. The schools are as ready for mainstreaming as our society was for desegregation. There are many arguments that can be put up and have been put up for mainstreaming; I am not going to go into them now (as I see, I am going to be running over my alloted time anyway), I'll have a chance later to say more.

What I want to do in my closing comments is to suggest areas to which we might move. The first has do with higher education generally and, more specifically, public education. A colleague of mine was doing some research on how principals experience their job. We met once a week, talking about the interviews he was having with principals. He called me one week and said, "Hey, you know I want you to look at the two interviews that I had with two principals both of whom are a year or so away from retiring." In the interview, he had questions that had to do with what they would do with a sabbatical.

Now, these two principals who are near retirement said, "I would like to go on and get a Ph.D.," and he laughed, "How silly." "Well," I said to him, "why is that silly? Here are people who want to go to school, who want further education for the best of reasons. They don't want a Ph.D. in order to enter a new work career, although if that were possible, why not? What they were saying is 'Hey, I would like to keep my mind active, I'd like to find out more about myself and more about this world. And I'd like it to be a challenge. I want to get a Ph.D.'" We look upon people like that with some suspicion. What I am saying here is that we are aware that there has been a decline in the college population. In many graduate fields there has been a decline in people seeking to enter those fields. I would like to suggest that part of our view is determined by a very traditional understanding of who our students are, who is our constituency, for whom do we exist? I would like to suggest that there are many people who would take advantage of higher education if it were made available to them, not from a standpoint of noblesse oblige, not as special students, but as people who want this for its intellectual excitment as a way of putting meaning into their lives. I tried to convince a few universities to do the following, and my batting average is zero. Pick an area where you don't get graduate students anymore, be it in languages or history, put an ad in the paper saying that you are going to admit x number of students for a doctoral program and people are going to have to pay their own way, the one limit area is that this is only available to people over fifty five years of age. Now, I am willing to bet that you would get good students who would want to get their doctorates. There is not necessarily the shortage of students in certain areas that we say. There is a shortage as long as we define our audience, the consumers, in the narrow way that we do.

Now where is education taking place? There is a fascinating book, a little paperback, by a poet named Kenneth Koch, in which he went into a very ordinary, traditional nursing home. I have spent a lot of time in nursing homes, unfortunately, so I have no reason to believe that this is an unusual nursing home. He decribes the people in the nursing homes, his students; his aim was to get them to write poetry. As you read this book consider how he got them to write poetry; what it meant to them. Is that education? Is this a place we should be training, preparing teachers for? Let me give you another example. There is no doubt in my mind, and I think that the evidence is very, very compelling on this score, that over the next twenty years, we are going to see a fantastic increase in the number of group residences for various kinds of individuals, for the mentally retarded, the juvenile delinquent, the senior citizen, the emotionally disturbed. These settings have increased fantastically in recent years, and we're just at the beginning. Now, who is thinking about how you start settings like this? Imagine the situation where the Ford Foundation walked in here and said, "Hey, we're going to give you ten million dollars to set up group residences. Your going to have to work out how you want to set up these residences; what the educational program will be; how you select people, and how you prepare them." I think our bankruptcy, in terms of answering these questions, would become clear within five minutes; the problem of how you locate, develop, and program for these various diverse kinds of small group residences. It's something, insofar as I can determine, that nobody in academia is paying any attention to. And yet, it is one of the sea swell developments that is taking place in our society with which we in academia will have to deal. I think I have gone beyond my allowed time.

Dr. T. Edward Hollander
(presentation)

I am pleased to participate in this cooperative project between the Departments of Education and Higher Education. Our problems are indeed similar and our futures very much intertwined.

There are, of course, areas of contention between the two Departments. Most of these result from honest differences of opinion which in the long run might prove to have been healthy. Whatever the case, I sense a compelling need for our two Departments to come closer together. Let me touch on some of the reasons why I think we should.

All of education is influenced by the same exogenous factors. Right now, we face a shift upward in the age of the population. Because of this, people are becoming more concerned about services to the elderly, health care services, social services, than they are with youth oriented services. As a result, the strong support that once existed for education and higher education has begun to ebb. Public confidence in education and higher education has begun to diminish as well. Wherever we look, the public seems to be saying to us that we ought to do better than we are doing now. It may well be that we overestimated our ability to solve problems which were rooted in areas outside the scope of education. Nevertheless, the public has come to expect much of us and we have to do a better job in fulfilling their expectations.

We live in a state that has a very peculiar tax structure. That structure, which dedicates resources to support state operations, makes for sound administration and allocation of resources during periods of price stability. It works poorly, however, during periods of inflation. About forty to fifty percent of our total tax revenue is unrelated to fluctuations in prices. These revenues do not rise as prices rise and they do not decline as prices fall.

Yet expenditures in education and higher education are directly related to personal services, so that as employees in our state seek to maintain their real income through increases in state expenditures, our resources do not keep pace because, in part, our revenues depend upon liquor sales and cigarette sales, which are based on volume rather than on sale price. Even our sales tax, which does respond to changes in price levels, is not sufficient to counterbalance these other constants. So we have in this state a periodic fiscal crisis. Thus, the Governor's budget, in order to be balanced, had to be a much leaner document than many, himself included, would have liked. To his credit, he brought the budget into balance without proposing or cutting back drastically on essential services. Yet, if this inflation persists, policy makers may some day have to consider adopting alternative tax structures that are equipped to deal with inflation as a permanent fact of life.

Even after they put one in place, we would still face a future in which resources would be constrained. The trend of ever increasing local and state taxing power in the post-World War II era ended abruptly and dramatically with the New York City fiscal crisis. We in education and higher education had benefitted significantly from the very, very sharp increase in taxing power as well as from the then-growing tax base for state and local government. I project that for the next several decades state and local taxes are likely to rise roughly in proportion to the general tax base. This is, there will be very few new taxes available to support state and local enterprises. If I am correct, we in education and higher education will have to function in an environment that has fewer resources at our disposal and in which education will have to compete with other pressing needs for public dollars. At the same time, we will see the size of the constituency we serve, at least the traditional constituency, stabilize or decline. In higher education, it will be on the decline for at least one or two decades.

In the past, we in education have been able to manage our growth. Much of the innovation and creativity that has historically characterized education and higher education came from our ability to expand our enterprise and bring young people into it. Now for the first time in memory, we will have to do this in a period of retrenchment. This means we will have to reallocate resources, improve inservice education, and raise education standards in order to assure that the monies public officials make available remain constant, let alone increase modestly. And in order to do this, we must begin to confront honestly some of the problems that face both education and higher education in this state.

I would like to discuss some of them with you, now, in the spirit of constructive self evaluation. Before I do, let me stress that we do a great many things right. (I'll save our virtues for my closing.) For now, let me address some of the things we could do better. The results of the Basic Skills Test we administered this past fall to all incoming freshman at New Jersey colleges confirmed what we had all suspected: large numbers of high school graduates are entering college unprepared and underprepared for college work. This is not a problem unique to New Jersey. It is national in scope. We know this because where we can compare achievement levels of New Jersey high school graduates with those of high school graduates in other states, our students' scores approximate the national average. Yet, knowing that our students do as poorly as do everybody else's gives me no cause for comfort. They should do better. (As the state with the second highest per capita income in the country, New Jersey should better prepare its students for college work than the rest of the country does.) After all, New York's students score well above the national average and that state has some of the same problems confronting it as ours does.

We cannot, in a society such as ours which places an increasing premium on skills, technology and literacy, send out young people unable to read sufficiently, write effectively, or perform simple mathematical calculations. I have to emphasize that what we tested in the Basic Skills Test was just that, the ability to read a freshman college text book, the ability to answer questions about it on paper, and the ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide. And our students did very poorly. We cannot, as a democratic society, permit declines in these skills among our young people. The human, societal, and even economic costs of such an approach render it prohibitive.

And it is our job as educators, at all levels, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary, to do something about it and to do it soon. Unless we take positive steps together to combat this new illiteracy, education and higher education will suffer the greatest decline in public esteem and support they have ever experienced. And rightly so.

Such is the nature of our common problem. What steps can we take to solve it? I would urge that we re-introduce the rigor that once characterized elementary and secondary school curricula. I fear that in New Jersey what passes for "local autonomy" has often thwarted the state in fulfilling its obligations to monitor these local standards effectively. I, for one, do not understand the value of local autonomy when it is used as a means of preventing the establishment of statewide standards for performance. While statewide standards need to take cognizance of special learning problems, learning skills, and learning disabilities, such as dyslexia; they should also articulate well defined goals and methods for attaining them. Where such standards have been imposed in other states, they have been successful.

In the area of higher education, we must be more forthcoming in our teacher education programs than we have been in recent years. Many of our college presidents and administrators have recognized that our institutions are first rate in teacher education. For them to remain so, we will have to commit newer and different resources to them and begin to recognize the need for improved teacher preparation.

There was a time ten years ago when some of the people in higher education felt we needed to change our emphasis completely in our state colleges from teacher training to the liberal arts. In the process, many of our colleges denegrated teacher training as a field unto itself. I do think that approach was correct. I think the preparation of teachers is as important, if not more important, to our society as the preparation of lawyers, physicians, and dentists because it is through education that we will either assure our future or deny it.

I am very pleased that the Newman Commission has been established to examine how we train future teachers in our colleges and universities and assess the standards through which we admit these graduates to the teaching profession. I have made a presentation through our staff to the Newman Commission in which I argued very strongly that before we license a teacher, we insist the individual has received a B.A. degree, has undergone a period of two or three years of internship on the job, has completed some professional training at the graduate level, and has endured an intensely rigorous evaluation. Our present system says anyone who graduates from a non-approved program but submits additional transcript information to the Department of Education, or graduates from any program and submits a transcript to the Department of Education, can receive a teacher's license. And that license is good for life, even though the person may never have taught or set foot in the classroom except as a student teacher.

What would our medical, legal, and engineering professions be if they provided such an approach to licensing? For the good of our profession, we must tighten up our licensing standards now even though we won't see the full impact of these changes for some 15 or 20 years because of slowness in the turn-over process. If we fail to act, we will not be able to attract, as we

did in your generation and mine, the best available people into teaching. Should this occur, the societal impact of our neglect will be no less than catastrophic.

We in higher education are working with the Department of Education and the Newman Commission to devise the best and most workable approach to teacher licensure. As you know, the licensure of teachers and program approval for teacher education rests within the Department of Education, as it should, since it is that Department that has the responsibility for primary and secondary education. Yet, we in higher education recognize the importance of rigor to teacher training and licensing, and believe current practices need to be made more rigorous.

Another area we are trying to sort out is inservice education. I agreed to come to this conference because I am delighted that the two Departments are already cooperating in the area of special education.

One can legitimately debate whether inservice education should be turned over to consulting firms or to other entities. In my view, inservice education ought to occur at the colleges and universities. They have the facilities, the faculties, and the personnel who possess the expertise and the commitment to the public school system and to education that are necessary in order to do the job well. If there are any weaknesses in this approach, as I'm sure there are, those weaknesses can be readily overcome. Programs need to be strengthened, if they need strengthening. But inservice education is a function that is best performed by our colleges, both public and private. Fred Burke and I have met recently with the four directors of the inservice centers to establish closer ties between our colleges and universities with the inservice centers. I think we will be able to work that out at some time in the future.

An additional area that warrants closer cooperation is vocational education. I believe we have reached good working relationships here. One of the weaknesses in our vocational education system, both in secondary and in postsecondary institutions, is that while we have adequate and sufficient programs in the traditional vocational and technical areas, we have not developed programs in the very high technologies, the highly sophisticated technologies which are so essential to New Jersey's economy.

While it is true that other states have been equally negligent, research and development are among the state's largest industries. For this reason, I am saddened that companies such as Bell Laboratories often have to look outside New Jersey for their technician crews and support staff.

We live in a state in which the unemployment rate among young people is relatively high. Yet there are sufficiently large numbers of jobs they could fill here if they have had the proper training. It is our responsibility to find a way of establishing high technology programs that prepare people for work in the sophisticated electronic industry, the chemical industry, the pharmaceutical industry, and the machine tool industry, so that they will not only find jobs, but provide the essential manpower to support the industrial presence that characterizes so much of New Jersey. Working with the Division of Vocational Education and the Department of Education, and with the Department of Labor and Industry, we are attempting to link particular companies and

industries with particular institutions in order to assure that kind of fine technology training. In doing so, we are using the industrial staff to meet the technical needs and using our college faculties to do what they can do best in the arts and sciences and support curriculum.

The final area where I think we have a common mission is the area of adult and continuing education. Although we probably over dramatize the demand in this country for life long learning, I am glad we are beginning to get into it. It is no secret that as the traditional college age population declines, the middle aged segment of our society will begin to grow - which gives me comfort since I am part of that group. These people are coming back to our colleges and universities in increasing numbers. Large numbers of women, for example, who are entering the job market for the first time, are coming onto our campuses for both technical training and academic instruction. So are large numbers of adults of both sexes we tended to ignore when higher education expanded so drastically in the 1960's. Large numbers of professionals who want to update themselves are coming back, too. Growing numbers of adults are seeking an education as an alternative to recreation or as a means of bettering themselves, whether professionally or personally.

While we should reach out to these people because it makes for sound public policy and serves a noble purpose, let us not pretend that this previously underserved constituency will so offset the diminishing numbers of young people that are beginning to shrink our enrollments. We cannot assume that the demand for higher education on the part of adults will increase at a rate commensurate with their number. I think it was the Chairman of the Board of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (Bill Jovanovich) who said he had visions of professors in one of the local colleges dragging their aged mothers off to the classroom in order to serve an adult population. Actually one college did practically that when it began operating at one of the homes for the aged in New York and financed the students' educational costs with federal funds.

As I promised I would, let me conclude by mentioning some of the things I think we have done well, both together and within our separate sectors. During the 50's and 60's, there was great ferment in this country. Everyone began considering new ways to serve the poor and open up the institutions in our society to the disadvantaged. While a number of these efforts failed in several sectors of our society, in all of education they succeeded. If there was any group in society that both reached out to the poor and disadvantaged populations of this country and provided them with the wherewithal to attain upward mobility, it was we. During the 1960's, while the numbers of high school students were high enough to sustain and expand our academic enterprise, whatever we did, our colleges and universities conscientiously extended access to a whole new population. Between 1962 and 1975, our college growing rate went from something like 20 to 30% up to 50 and 60% of that college age population. That would be a major accomplishment by any segment of our society and I think that we should be proud of what we did.

There is much more to be done, and I am not arguing that the task is finished. Our record is one in which we can take pride. We put into place a statewide system of open access and reduced or eliminated economic barriers to higher education through new financial aid programs. We met our construction needs without overbuilding; we met our financing needs and lived within our budgets. In the last ten years, we built a complete system of higher education. If you

look at the data for those years, you will see that revenues have tripled, available space increased fourfold, and enrollments reached three times their previous rates. Our state colleges became fairly broad based institutions and Rutgers University emerged as a nationally recognized institution. Ten years ago there were practically no community colleges in this state; now there are 18. When I reflect on how far we have come, I think we have no cause to be ashamed of New Jersey's higher education system. And yet, it is often said that the state here does not support higher education.

Every time I meet with a faculty group, somebody pounds on the table and says, "But we are 49th in the country in per capita income devoted to higher education." I have often said this myself. Whenever I go before a legislative committee I say, "We are 49th - we need more money."

The truth of the matter is this state has supported higher education very well. If we consider that 40% of our students leave the state to go to college, which is unfortunate, and that another 25% of those who remain go to independent colleges which receive little state support, the balance of the funds, $400,000,000 for higher education on a per student basis is probably up in the mid-range of state support. This being the case, it probably does us little good telling the Governor and the Legislature that they are not supportive enough of our efforts when, in fact, they are and they know they are.

One thing which I found particularly interesting about this state, as a newcomer from New York, was that a very different attitude toward education existed here than that to which I had grown accustomed. I used to tell the story about a New York legislator, who when asked which was worse for education, ignorance or apathy, said, "I don't know and I don't care." (I swear this is a true story.) Here, I find that within the executive and legislative branches, people do know and they do care. And as a result, a warm and positive feeling exists among them toward our enterprise. They are attempting to deal with our budgetary problems and want to provide us with more support if they can possibly find the necessary funds. This is why I find this a preferable working environment to that which exists across the Hudson River, where they are literally savaging the city university system and beginning to take apart the state university system. For all these reasons, I am optimistic about the future of education in New Jersey.

Even so, the responsibility is ours with respect to how well our children learn and how well they do when they come to college. If we accept that responsibility, if we are forthcoming about our weaknesses, and if we carry out our social responsibilities as a system of higher education, I think we will continue to get the support we will need to do our job right.

CONFERENCE REACTIONS

A. Summary of Small Group Reports

B. Observer Reactions

Grace Bingham, Assistant Professor, Rutgers Graduate School of Education

Mark Chamberlain, President, Glassboro State College

George Daniel, Superintendent of Schools, Bound Brook, New Jersey

Marianne Schmieder, Special Education Teacher, Washington Township

Bruce Waldman, Dean, School of Professional Studies and Education, Jersey City State College

Charles B. Yates, New Jersey State Senate, District 7

C. Dialogue Between Dr. Hollander and Dr. Sarason

## A. SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP REPORTS

Fishbowl I was a report to the conference participants of the proceedings during the small group sessions. The presenters during this segment were Dr. Milton Schwebel (Rutgers), Mr. Jeffery Pollack (William Paterson), Mr. Thomas Brown (SEA), Dr. Harold Scholl (Montclair State), Dr. John Callan (Seton Hall), and Dr. George Westmoreland (Montclair State).

The task in the small groups was to identify behaviors, procedures, ways of work and attitudes that should be different so that the way of life in the institution would be more productive and rewarding both from a personal and organizational perspective. Three major categories of responses emerged - teacher training issues, faculty issues and system wide communication issues.

Teacher Training

The role of the college/university faculty in teacher training was a major concern in the small group sessions. While there was a sense that much of the criticism of teacher education is based upon lack of knowledge of what is being done within colleges of education, statements were made regarding areas that deserve attention within the colleges to improve the quality of teacher education. It was seen as vital that students come to know and experience the relationship between substantive materials learned in college, and life itself. This knowledge is essential if students, when they become teachers, are to bring to life the subject matter that they will be teaching. Faculty in post-secondary education must orient their students to the personal meaningfulness and usefulness of the knowledge and skills that they are charged to master.

The suggestion was made that within schools of education disciplines should be interrelated and the artificial barriers that separate the various disciplines should be overcome. Movement of this type calls for action within the colleges, their departments, and the faculty, themselves. This movement, on the part of the faculty, requires no outside approval and it could have immediate positive effects on teaching. The results would be that students might better see the interrelationships among various fields of knowledge and make the context of their own teaching more meaningful. This was not a call for educators to become jacks-of-all-trades; the desire is for a continuation of specialization along with disciplinary integration. Students of education must recognize that learning, itself, is a rigorous discipline, and their training like that of other professionals, should be marked by that quality.

Participants viewed theories, related to methods of teaching, as continually evolving. New abstractions are developing based on the growing knowledge of how children learn. Future teachers must learn these new ways of engaging children in problem solving and of overcoming deficits in skill areas. A major challenge in the area of methods is to address the issue of the realities of the public school setting. The insulation of both college students and higher education faculty was seen as hindering the understanding of children with severe problems, especially those in ghetto areas. As a result, many new teachers, unaware of the day to day activities within the classroom become bewildered and, hence, leave the teaching profession. There must be a linkage between the methods taught in the college classroom and the methods needed to address the realities of the public school classroom.

In the area of teacher training for special educators, there was a stated need for extended and more meaningful field-based training so that the potential teacher will develop a clear clinical notion of the professional experience. The master teacher structure should be eliminated if there are not a sufficient supply of effective professionals to provide inspiration and preparation. A return to the campus school system where the college/university would have more opportunity to control the nature of training and supervision within the field experience might be considered.

Certification standards were seen as within the realm of the college/university. Many certifications, it was suggested, are awarded on the basis of transcript evaluation which insures neither an institutional accountability nor the completion of a sequentially planned program. The state, instead of worrying so much about administrative details with regard to certification, could render a valid and genuine service by affirming its belief in the approved program approach to certification.

Faculty Issues

The second major area of discussion during the small group sessions had to do with college faculty members, themselves. A recurring theme was the relationship of faculty members in special education to the community at large. An expressed conflict was that requests from the community are not in line with research priorities, which have been identified by college administrations. There was a call for more academic credibility for practical applied research which tends to identify and address needs within the community. This applied research was seen as leading to preservice programs which assume a proactive stance, that is, projecting training needs for the future. Inservice was seen as another area of active research in which faculty members have a strong community interest. Inservice was viewed as an extremely important tool which could be used to merge the discrepancies between the reality of life in the classroom and the theoretical training that is presented in preservice, to acquaint teachers with new ongoing developments in educational research and to respond to the mandates of public law. The college and university has a role in offering services to parents of handicapped children. The services that can be rendered are to introduce educational activities and strategies which have been developed to attain maximum growth potential for the handicapped child and, also, to aid parents in understanding their rights and duties relating to PL 94-142. Many conference participants suggested that these should be issues of major concern to higher education, now and in the future. There is a hesitancy, however, to undertake these tasks since they are not rewarded by promotion and tenure, as are research and publishing. The tendency is to accept the tasks that are most highly rewarded. A recommendation was to reorder and expand priorities so that they will address the needs of the community, collegiate peers, college administrations and the Department of Higher Education.

Along with the need to redefine the focus of the college educator, conference participants addressed the issue of revitalizing the population of college faculty members. Continuing education programs designed to keep faculty members current with newly developing information and exchange of personnel, theory and knowledge interdepartmentally were seen as necessary steps to retain and renw the prestige of the college educator.

Communications Issues

The third major theme which emerged in the small sessions was communication. Lack of effective communication across the entire spectrum of involvement in the delivery of services to children was cited as a severe problem. This lack of communication creates misinterpretations, frustrations and triangling between and among the various levels of personnel and departments involved in education. The need, then, was identified to improve communication links intradepartmentally and interdepartmentally; between institutions of higher education and public and private schools; within the two education departments in the state hierarchy; between the educational community and the community at large; and between general education and special education.

Recommendations to alleviate this non-productive situation were an active commitment, on all levels, to the reduction of territorial biases and an increase of sharing and understanding among the various levels of operation; sensitivity to the educational structure as a continuum in which each part is affected by the others; development of personnel exchange programs within the educational structure; and development of jointure commissions to explore areas of concern and controversy with the objective of identifying and disseminating common policy.

Stephen J. Kiernan

## B. OBSERVER REACTIONS

REPORT OF DR. GRACE BINGHAM
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Following a conference such as this one, each of us is left with a number of ideas which still require further processing before their full range of meaning can be extracted. Depending on which self-in-role one chooses as the vantage point from which to view phenomena, the meaning that emerges is likely to be idfferent even for the same individual. I have chosen as my role, "faculty member at a large university," and will try to keep my reactions within that frame of reference. Having said that, I am not certain I can maintain as singular a perspective as that statement implies. For while "faculty" implies dispenser of educational processes and products, I am at the same time a consumer of those processes and products. As a faculty member, I am the beneficiary of resources allocated to the educational community, but as a citizen of the larger community, I am also a provider of those resources. Nevertheless, as a faculty member, there are certain professional issues that are perceived differently by me than they are by a college administrator, a state department official, or the public at large. It is from such a context that I will direct my remarks.

Institutional Mission

Colleges and universities are among the institutions of society undergoing careful scrutiny from many quarters. Professional exchanges and informal discussions with colleagues at other colleges and universities throughout the country sustain my impression that the situation current in New Jersey is not unique to our state. While specific manifestations may differ resulting from New Jersey's position as a densely populated, industrial, multi-cultural area, the underlying comparisons with other states still obtain. The obvious, visible symptons of the malaise that afflicts institutions of higher education can be seen in dwindling enrollments and diminishing financial resources. But, there are other, "sub-clincial" symptons affecting institutions of higher education that concern me. Though less easily detectable, their effects may be more damaging in the long run.

Among the most troubling and most elusive of those symptoms is the continuing inability of institutions of higher education to identify, define and articulate thei. mission. More importantly, perhaps, is their inability to affirm it with conviction to their constituencies. Universities and colleges have failed to delineate lucidly their place and purpose in the structure of today's society.

Part of the problem in not having accomplished what appears to be a pre-requisite task is that colleges and universities have been unable to agree among themselves about what constitutes their unique contribution to the fabric of American life. The resulting ambiguity has lead to uneasiness and confusion among both the dispensers and consumers of the educational output.

One might argue that "purposes," "goals" and "missions" are not static constructs but subject to influence by whatever prevailing social and economic forces are operating within the broader society and therefore, must be considered "in process," reacting to those forces. That argument misses a key

point which is, that without a mission or purpose that is clear in their own "heads," institutions of higher education will continue to mirror societal changes rahter than contribute to shaping both the nature and direction of that change.

It might help to remind ourselves that institutions such as colleges and universities are not monolithic structures, but macrosystems comprised of a network of sub-systems, each having its own set of goals and priorities. We would like to believe that institutions of higher education operate from an over-all "grand design," a supra-structure of goals that coalesces the sub-parts into a logical organized whole. If that is indeed the case, then it has not been made apparent either to those of us who work within the institutions, or to the bulk of interested outside observers. Some may argue at this point that almost all institutions have a "master plan," one which is periodically revised and often laced with an impressive set of figures to support projections. A closer look at most such plans finds them to be missing what I consider the most essential element. Instead of a clearly explicated set of principles arising from an examined set of values, one finds a compilation of platitutidinous statements which have a hollow ring.

One of the first responsibilities of our colleges and universities during the eighties is to face squarely their own vulnerability, address it forcefully, eschew expedient measures and opt for the courageous route of critical self-examination.

Administrative leadership

What part should faculty and administrators play in the process of institutional self-scrutiny? The expectation, of course, is that both groups should and will contribute in some fashion to the identification of meaningful goals. The type and quality of that contribution, however, will depend to a large extent on the climate that prevails within the institution, and whether it is designed to enhance or inhibit participation. Here we encounter another of my so-called "sub-clinical" symptoms--tge erosion of confidence in administrative leadership.

Institutional leadership requires a rare blend of qualities. In addition to managerial skills and inter-personal competencies, administrators must have a visionary outlook that establishes a tone for the entire institution. As faculty members whose activity and experience is limited to only a part of the institutional sub-system, few of us as individuals have available the scope of information that would permit us to judge whether critical institutional decisions are fair, equitable, consonant with professional and ethical values. As institutional complexity makes it increasingly difficulty for us to analyze and judge those decisions on our own, we must rely increasingly on our leaders whose access to the information base of other parts of the system is broader than our own. But, administrative behavior at institutions of higher education during the past ten years has not provided us with the models of leadership that serve to increase our confidence. Pre-occupation with financial concerns has engaged a disproportionate share of administrative time. Those concerns now have reached a point where they seem to permeate of "contaminate" all facets of administrative functioning. No one denies the importance of operating a college or university on a foundation of sound fiscal policy.

Equally understandable is administrators' desire to keep increasing their institutions' funding support. But, what I observe to be occuring these days is a pervasive tendency for administrative decisions to be made on the basis of financial and political considerations, but to be justified as if they had been made for pedagogical reasons. Administrative integrity is neither preserved nor enhanced by that kind of delusion, whether intentional or otherwise.

As faculty, we find ourselves struggling with a paradox. At a time which calls for even greater reliance on administrative competence and integrity, our confidence in such leadership seems to have diminished. In the eighties we need to see the return of administrative integrity and authenticity in order to restore that sense of share collaboration between faculty and administration in the search for meaningful goals.

Faculty roles

In view of what has been said thus far, a question might well be raised about where the faculty fits into the current scheme of things at today's colleges and universities. How have the seventies affected this segment of the higher education community? Anyone close to the academic scene, particularly during the past five years, has either witnessed or experienced personally the painful process of professional reassessment that has been going on. Whether it was triggered by the prevailing climate of budgetary constraints, as many faculty seem to think, or whether it evolved as a by-product of an increased attention to quality control, as administrators contend, is difficulto to judge. But the outcome is a state of disequilibrium that is still extant, and which leaves today's faculty uncertain about the value of their professional contribution. Traditionally, faculties have regarded themselves as having two major, and equally important responsibilities--demonstration of teaching effectiveness, and production of original research that adds to the knowledge base of their academic disciplines. It is precisely the dynamic balance between the two role expressions that produces the posture of inquiry, the critical analysis, and the commitment to scholarship that constitutes the best learning environment for students. But lately, there is a trend on the part of those evaluating faculty performance to disregard that balance and place undue value on only one part, research productivity. All faculty members are judged by the same evaluative criteria, with particular overemphasis placed on publications. What is overlooked by present day evaluators is that faculty perform different roles within the institutional setting. Indeed, in many cases, they were sought and hired because they possessed particular competencies which were regarded as necessary to the operational structure of the institutional plan as a whole. Yet, littler or no consideration is given to that aspect in the evaluation process.

Here I might note what I identify as the "sub-clinical" symptom relating to faculty and their position in the institutional framework,--an increase in psychological distance. The environment at many colleges and universities appears to be encouraging faculty to turn inward, to focus on their own individual agendas and away from a sense of community with their colleagues and with the institution as a whole. If that trend continues, then we will have reason for concern during the next decade. Faculty, like all humans, are basically social beings, and while they value their autonomy, they also need a

feeling of affiliation in order to experience personal and professional self-fulfillment. If that affiliation is not be found in the institutional setting, then they will seek it elsewhere, very likely within their own disciplines. The effect will be isolation and distance from the institutional body. We need to look for ways in which faculties can continue to accomplish individual goals while still maintaining an affiliation and the feeling of participation in the broader goals of the institutional community.

Summary

As a new decade approaches, we fell a need to take a wide angle view of the past ten years to search for important trends, key decisions, influential forces which have affected American education during the seventies. Since ours is an age that abounds in "systems" or "models" for information processing, it not difficult to find the broad organizing principles that help arrange events into some logical order. While that provides a certain level of meaning, somehow it does not entirely satisfy our need. For what we seem to be seeking is something much more elusive and less easily available in our deadline oriented society. Our desire seems to be for a deeper understanding, one that can result only from contemplative reflection, or what we might call interpretative wisdom. But since neither we, as individuals, nor our professional leadership engage in such a process routinely or with ease, we are left with the alternative that our understanding represents at best a subjective and shortsighted perspective. While we can acknowledge that to be the case, we still yearn for a transcendent meaning, one which requires a level of sagacity to which we aspire but which we realize we have not quite achieved.

We might approach the eighties, then, not with the question of whether institutional change is needed, for we know already that whether it is needed or not, it will occur. Our energies as concerned faculty should be directed toward examining whether we still have the power to penetrate the elaborate networks that have been devised, ostensibly to promote change, and to what extend that change reflects the human values we so glibly espouse in theory and so readily ignore in practice.

REPORT OF DR. MARK M. CHAMBERLAIN
PRESIDENT, GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE

The opening speakers, small discussion groups, "fishbowl" discussions and summary statements demonstrated, as should be expected within such a diverse group, a wide ranging variety of perceptions of the role of higher education in the training of teachers. Similar diversity was evident in discussion of the internal barriers to effective operations within higher education and the relationship that do and should exist between the world of the colleges and universities and the external (real?) world.

Three intertwining themes developed across the morning:

1. There is a greater need for cooperation and interaction between college faculties/students and the real world. The keynote speaker highlighted the perception of discrepancy between the realities of the public education systems and the college training of people to work within these systems. Discussion groups emphasized the need for earlier exposure of students to the real world of the schools through early field experience programs. Exchange of faculty between the college/university and the schools was suggested as another means to bridge the perceived gap between campus and real world.

2. Communications within the higher education system itself is poor; particularly there appears to be little general understanding or even awareness of programs developing within the many institutions of the higher education system. There is even poorer understanding of the responsibilities of the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Education in the area of teacher education. There is however a clear, and erroneous, perception that communication by directives from the top will solve such internal institutional problems as: (a) the relative weight to be given research and teaching/community service in tenure, recontracting and promotion decisions and (b) the allocation of resources to faculty development and retooling, programs in teacher education, community service programs and in-service education programs for public school teachers.

3. There is a strong and growing determination on the part of the profession to devise even more highly professionally oriented undergraduate programs, increase student selectivity for entrance to these programs and strengthen (make more difficult) certification requirements for entrance to the profession. This determination is reinforced by the demands of the external world that the pro fessional should be more highly trained, more attune to the needs of the schools and of private institutions working with the handicapped, and more expert in all aspects of his or her craft.

(At this point, I wonder how well my perceptions agree with those of others in attendance at the meeting of December 19th. I have a strong feeling that as the reports of the meeting are written and circulated, many will be asking whether indeed, we all were attending the same meeting. So be it. Permit me the luxury of expressing my own views on some of the issues raised.)

First, the strong emphasis on increased professionalism, demand for increased professional expertise and "higher standards" for admission to the profession is understandable but may also be pernicious. On the one hand, as the demand for new professionals decreases, those already in feel that, finally, they can demand highers levels of professional expertise from those seeking to enter the field. The new professional is now expected to be able to hit his/her job running and not have to spend time in on-the-job-learning. This feeling meshes well with the public's demand for accountability and evidence of effectiveness in the use of increasingly scarce public funds. Higher standards are also seen as answer to public criticism of the teaching professions.

On the other hand, to assume that development of increased professional competency is the sole function of a college or university, particularly at the undergraduate level, is to misunderstand the nature of higher education. There is more to formal higher education than preparation for a profession. A breadth of education is necessary if the individual is to understand himself/herself, the world in which one lives and how best to meet and understand the future. At the least, the graduate should be able to differentiate between sense and nonsense whether found in the external world or within his/her own mind. Pragmatically and philosophically there is need for a balance between professional training and breadth of education at the undergraduate level. There is a limited amount of time available in a four or even five-year program and a balance must be struck between the needs for professional training and breadth of education. I cannot agree to excess on either side. Thus, an expansion of professional training at the expense of a breadth of education is as unacceptable as would be denigration of the professional responsibilities of higher education. Further, increasing the height and number of hurdles for entrance to any profession is not necessarily the best approach to ensuring quality within the profession. The ability to put professional responsibilities into a human context, the willingness and ability to continue to learn throughout one's professional career are of equal importance to rigorous and realistic entrance standards.

Second, the reliance upon someone, somewhere else to solve institutional problems is misplaced. If research and publication requirements for recontracting, tenure and promotion stand in the way of in-service teaching and community involvement, then either the system should be changed internally or the individual adversely affected should seek employment at a university or college more attune to his or her value system. Further, not every institution of higher education must assume responsibility for basic research and community service and in-service education. Differentiation of institutional mission is desirable; perhaps the university emphasis upon research is well placed and direct community service and in-service education is a responsibility better assumed by colleges offering no more than the M.A. or the Ed.S. degree. Mission differentiation is a responsibility of the institution itself and once determined, criteria for tenure etc. flow from that determination.

At least within public higher education, central authority does have strong program control through resource allocation. Here, perhaps, is where "they" can be pursuaded to provide additional support to well conceived programs that will strengthen the professional preparation in special education or in direct community service or in the inservice areas. It must be recognized that "they" must also set priorities in the allocation of scarce resources to higher education in general and to specific sectors of the higher education system. Final decision on resource allocations are, in fact, made at the local campus level albeit within specific guidelines and the actual gross allocations made to the institution through the budget process.

Finally, there is need for better communications among professionals in the field, between practitioners and professors and among institutions engaged in teaching and research in special education. My own suggestion would be conventions, workshops and symposia devoted to an exchange of ideas, new concepts and curricula, research results and experiences--rather than meetings to discuss articulation and communications as subjects worthy of special attention. Collectively, the professions evolve goals through sharing of common experiences and recognition of common problems. I am not convinced that this evolutionary process is aided by conferences called to discuss problems that are essentially administrative and therefore of secondary importance.

* * * * * *

After drafting this portion of my perceptions of the Project Update Conference, I was asked to respond to several additional specific questions. Dissertations, position papers--and novels--could be written on each. I will attempt to be brief.

My comments are explicitly applicable for those institutions that have chosen to commit appreciable resources to teacher education.

(1) The role of the college in the profession of education? The college is responsible:

(a) to prepare broadly educated citizens also prepared to become competent teachers in the schools and in other agencies with educational responsibilities;

(b) to work, cooperatively, with other agencies and particularly currently employed teachers, to ensure regular and continuing updating and upgrading of professional skills;

(c) to study, to develop, to evaluate, to synthesize and to disseminate new information and new ideas bearing upon the profession of education. This is research, pure and applied.

(d) to provide a forum for the free and open exchange of ideas, perceptions and experiences among professionals, both faculty and active practitioners alike.

(2) How should institutions address these responsibilities? Institutions meet these responsibilities by:

(a) examination and evaluation of existing curricular patterns, as they bear upon teacher education, both within professional education and throughout the institution;

(b) continual modification and change of curriculum and ways of teaching, based upon both the internal research described in (a) and external research and feedback done by others;

(c) research, both basic and applied in the theory and practice of education and in the social and behavioral sciences which form the theoretical base for the profession;

(d) development of effective programs for in-service continuing education of teachers and other practitioners, such development to be done in cooperation with those who will be participants in the programs.

(3) Responsibility of faculty? College faculty:

(a) assume primary responsibility for items (a), (b) and (c) in 2 above and cooperative responsibility with administration, external agencies and the constituency to be served for 2(d);

(b) are also responsible, in partnership with their institutions, for their own continuing education as professionals. This continuing education should include, but is not limited to, regular and direct involvement with the professional world outside the higher education system.

Note: Neither faculty nor their institutions should be directly responsible for delivery of service to students other than those matriculated in the institution or in in-service and continuing education programs.

(4) Responsibility of administration? College administration must:

(a) ensure that only the most highly competent faculty are hired, retained and promoted;

(b) ensure that the responsibilities of 2(a-d) are being met through gentle administrative cajoling and direct administrative leadership;

(c) provide a reasonable level of resources to support the faculty in meeting its responsibilities both individually and collectively. The magnitude of such support will depend upon the total resources available and priorities set within the institution;

(d) encourage faculty to secure grants and contracts, to assist in meeting particular research and service needs, and provide the infrastructure to administer these grants from inception through termination. The institution both leads and supports in such grant activitiy;

(e) ensure, as far as possible, that the institution as a whole understands and is supportive of the work being done in the teacher education programs.

(5) Responsibility of the state? The state is responsible to:

(a) assess statewide needs in all areas from higher education to road building and provide a level of resources that reflect the priorities (values) of the citizens of the state in these several areas;

(b) ensure coordinated effort in meeting the needs of its citizens;

(c) establish minimum standards for entrance into the teaching profession and to ensure that these standards are met;

(d) demand that realistic goals be set by the profession, by colleges and unversities, by the schools and by other agencies providing service directly to students. These goals should reflect (1) the needs of those to be served and (2) a careful assessment of the resources available to meet these needs;

(e) hold the profession, the institutions of higher education and the various agencies providing service accountable for wise and effective use of resources by regular evaluation and comparison of goals and actual accomplishments.

REPORT OF DR. GEORGE H. DANIEL, SUPERINTENDENT
BOUND BROOK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. What is the role of the college/university in the profession of education? The college/university 1) provides liberal education for the citizenry, 2) conducts research to develop better methods of teaching, and 3) trains competent pracitioners for the professions, vocations, etc.

2. How should institutions of higher learning address this charge? They should address it by 1) screening candidates for admission and for teachers' degrees, 2) insist that only competently trained people receive degrees, and 3) carry on the above research and teaching.

3. What should be the responsibility of faculty at these institutions? The faculty should 1) conscientiously teach candidates, 2) develop research programs promoting better education, 3) participate in the governance of the university, 4) promote professionalism and avoid unionism with the less work, more pay syndrome, and 5) constantly strive for personal and professional improvement.

4. What should be the responsibility of administration at these institutions? Administration should provide leadership, staff time, budget, and materials for research and teaching. Administration should be flexible and not hamper faculty with unnecessary bureaucracy and paperwork. Administration should stand behind faculty in developing high standards of teaching and research.

5. What should be the responsibility of the state? The State Legislature should provide funds for teaching, research, library and buildings. It should pass laws upholding procedures for maintaining reasonable and appropriate academic standards. It should pass laws upholding procedures for maintaining reasonable and appropriate academic standards. It should pass laws that will promote and finance higher education.

The Department of Higher Education should provide statewide planning, articulation and coordination of the respective college programs.

> "In the disorderly American system, reform has been directed at improving integration at state and national levels with a pronounced upward drift of authority. This is contrasted with the French and Italians who, being conscious of the vices rather than virtues of nationalized structures, are faced with a need to move authority downward."
>
> Burton R. Clark

While the Department of Higher Education has an important role to play in determining broad goals and in influencing resource allocation, it should concentrate upon providing a policy framework for decision making at the individual college or university level. Beware of excessive centralization of authority!

REPORT OF MARIANNE SCHMIEDER, TEACHER
WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP

In view of P.L. 94-142 and current trends in special education and inservice, three changing roles appear for the colleges/universities in the 1980's: 1) the revision of preservice programs; 2) the development of a continuous consultant's role within a school district; and 3) the development and delivery of inservice.

In order to fully prepare new teachers for the handicapped children that they will receive in their regular class, preservice revision is needed. Future teachers must be provided with the knowledge and the skills necessary to effectively teach the handicapped. A course offering an overview of the various handicapping conditions and their effect upon the learner would be appropriate. Also, an extension of methods and materials courses specifically geared to the mainstreamed child, including methods of adapting materials and alternative teaching strategies and techniques, is necessitated.

A vast resource of personnel, ideas, contacts, and materials exists at all institutions of higher learning. The development of a consultant who would have continous contact within a district provides a natural linkage between the L.E.A. and the colleges/universities. Continuous contact provides a consultant knowledgeable of the district's needs, personnel, administrators, and problems, thus being a more effective consultant. The State Department of Education's Mainstreaming Inservice Project already has successfully developed the consultant's role in fifty districts.

The consultant should also aid in the development of a system of inservice. This process should include needs assessment, planning, and evaluation. The consultant may participate in actual inservice, but his role should not be limited to that of an expert. He can share his knowledge in developing needs assessment instruments, evaluation tools, and planning processes.

The state and colleges/universities must recognize and reinforce the changing roles. The state should provide financial support for consultants, inservice development, and preservice curriculum revision. The colleges/universities need to recognize the consultant's role as a legitimate usage of time equal to and in place of actual course teaching. Course revision must be seen as a priority, have personnel assigned, and be equally funded. Thus, financial support, recognition, and allocated time must be provided for these alternatives to develop.

REPORT OF DR. BRUCE WALDMAN, DEAN
JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE

It seems to me that the role of the college in the education of teachers, both pre-service and in-service, is vital. There is a brown mood in America that proposes that our institutions - political, church, and educational - have failed us. What is more likely is that the public has simply "gotten out in front" and what is needed is a revitalization of those institutions.

There are a number of proposals for change in the education of teachers. For example, in the late sixties and early seventies the alternate college/university was seen as one path to Nirvana. Its advocates seemed to believe that they could turn back the clock to those halcyon days in which education was simply Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other. In short, they believed that education ought to be a cottage industry.

There is a more recent proposal which suggests that the education of teachers should be the responsibility of the professional associations. It assumes that what is needed and desirable is simply the honing of skills and competencies. However, if continued growth, change, and improvement are needed, then the professional association, whose prime responsibility is the economic interest and betterment of its members, is unlikely to serve society except as a lesser consideration.

The colleges/universities can serve us with exactly the strengths they have always had for research and community service. What those institutions badly need in general, and in New Jersey in particular, is a commitment to action research programs in its various communities. The interactions inherent in such an approach are likely to be as healthy for higher education as it would be for the communities with which they become involved.

There needs to be more of a partnership among the local schools, in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, and the colleges. Theory without practicality or practicality without theory are untenable positions which serve no one. At Jersey City State College we have been fortunate in being able to develop an ongoing relationship with a number of city schools in which we - administrators, teachers, and pre-service teachers - are colleagues. We meet frequently, exchange experiences and ideas, and develop professionalism.

Well, you ask, why haven't more such activities been taking place on an on-going basis? If there is a villain then it is the Department of Higher Education. For eleven years teacher education has been the whipping boy. It is no secret that the previous Chancellor was not enamored of teacher education. It became popular through frequent pronouncements by the Chancellor and almost daily "exposes" in the press that teacher education was undoubtedly responsible for the death of Tutankhamun; the disappearance of Judge Crater; the loss of China; and the lack of probity in American political affairs. Thus it was not suprising that those involved in the education of New Jersey teachers simply withdrew. There was a self-fulfilling prophecy in which the faculty and administrators became bad, not through overt measures but simply because they pulled in their ears, hunkered down, and simply did not advance. After all, one does not advance while in a defensive posture.

One of the more encouraging developments in New Jersey is the directness with which the Department of Higher Education now approaches the education of teachers. The present Chancellor appears to be serious about review and improvement but it is likely to take more than rhetoric to bring needed change. Resources are required and there is little evidence at this writing that they will be available.

REPORT OF HON. CHARLES B. YATES
NEW JERSEY STATE SENATE, DISTRICT #7

I was fascinated by the first speaker reminding us that we have perhaps oversold ourselves on the benefits of science, that we have perhaps too much faith in federal intervention in any and all problems.

We were told that the university also oversold itself in the same way that science has been oversold. The fascinating discussion that led from that was followed by Chancellor Hollander who raised a kind of a clarion call, and pointed out the urgent problems; the falling test scores, the changing constituency, the need for changes in basic instruction and teacher preparation programs.

We are told we need tougher licensure. We have to restore rigor into the system. We must have heavier emphasis on inservice training. We need courses to prepare teachers to deal with parents. We should perhaps not only undertake the education of the children, but undertake the education of the parents as well so that we know that they are doing a proper job in the home.

Over the last several years we have had to live with New Jersey Chapter 212, the legislature's wisdom in the area of education, and I would like to suggest that we are perhaps once again overselling our ability in the field of education.

We assume that the university is the place where we can take raw material in the form of recent high school graduates and turn them into teachers. From the discussion I heard you would almost wonder that we can afford to let children go home and reside with their parents for 12 or 16 hours a day. Dad might give the child a little bit of group interaction guidance, but Dad does not have a degree in sociology. Or Mother might actually get involved in a little bit of sex education for the child, but for all we know she never had an approved, certified course.

I see a kind of pincer movement happening here that frankly does not make a great deal of sense. On the one hand we are talking about tighter, stricter, tougher, and harder certification while, at the same time, we are talking about Federal, State, Department of Education, local board, county superintendent guidelines, follow-through, monitoring, etc. At the same time that we want the teachers to be better, we want them to have less latitude in enjoying the simple privilege of deciding how they want to go about teaching and what it is they want to teach. I would like to suggest to you that all of the emphasis on how to improve teacher education may be heading in exactly the wrong direction. The direction it ought to be heading, I think, is that of educating potential teachers to be whole, complete, educated human beings. Less emphasis on the courses that teach teaching, more emphasis on the teachers themselves having a decent education in science, understanding a little bit of human physiology, mathematics and all of the other broad curricula that make people into complete human beings.

I am concerned with getting back to basic in the colleges themselves. Let's rid outselves of this obsession with over professionalization.

## C. DIALOGUE: DRS. SARASON AND HOLLANDER

Summary Dialogue - Dr. Hollander and Dr. Sarason (derived from taped comments)

Chancellor Hollander:

Well I have learned two things. I have seen the enemy and he is me. The second thing that I have had reinforced for me is that education takes place with students in the classroom; it doesn't take place in Trenton and it doesn't take place in the administration of the college. I think the most compelling lesson for me of this dialogue, and I hope you have learned as much as I have here, is that the real progress will be made when those of us who are responsible for resource allocation find a way of allocating those resources with as much flexibility, to the people who use them, as we can and with as much support for those members of our faculty who are able and willing to take risks for both self improvement and improvement of their educational enterprise. Someone told me, and I believe it, I have experienced it, that an institution with a faculty that is first rate is an institution in good hands because that faculty creates the environment in which it is able to function effectively. How one gets to that, of course, is a very difficult question.

Dr. Sarason:

What I am impressed by, and what I am going to say, is no less true for me than anybody else in this room. Faced with a problem, faced with a need to act, we are unaware of how we constrict the universe of alternatives available to us. Now, for many of the problems that we have been discussing, there is in fact a vast universe of alternatives that our past background experience just blinds us to. Not only does it blind us, it engenders an adversarial relationship to the idea. Let me give you an example. Senator Yates said that we ought to concentrate on the understanding that college students, regardless of whether they are going into teaching or wherever else they are going, should have an understanding of themselves, of the basic subject matter. In some ways that is no less important, over the long term it may be more important, than anything else you can give them. Without disagreeing with that I would like to suggest that one of the most impressive characteristics, in a very discouraging way to me, of people who are going into teaching is how abysmally ignorant they are of the culture of the school. For example, I once did an informal study, I had students in a teacher training program keep a daily log during their student teaching. I wanted to know with whom they talked in the course of any one day. As you might guess, they talked the most with the teacher in their room. Nine out of ten of them never even met, let alone had anything to do with, the teacher next door or the teacher on the other side. None of them ever met a school psychologist, one sat down for five minutes with the superintendent of schools, nobody ever said "hey I'll tell you what pupil personnel is all about." Their conception of the school culture is - here is a classroom and that is it. I would like to suggest a plan that I suggested several years ago at another meeting in New Jersey and practically got ridden out of the state, and that is, I would say to anybody who was thinking of going into the field of education that they have to take one year during which a series of experiences would be provided for them in the school system, from spending time with the superintendent to pupil personnel. In other words, by the end of the year they will have gained some understanding of what I call the culture of the school, where they are going to be spending their lives. Now, you can look at the culture of the school from the political standpoint, the problem of power and the distribu-

tion of power. You can look upon it as a traditional institution which is transmitting a culture. There are all kinds of ways that you could look at a school which would not conflict with a liberal arts tradition. I would suggest that, spending a year in that way, would allow for better career choice decisions. Do you want to be in education? And when I say put them in the school for a year, I don't mean to put them in the best schools or with the so-called best teachers but to enable them to understand what it is like to be in ghetto schools, to see what high schools are like, they are one of the worst disaster areas in our society. That is one way you can go.

What I have been hearing is a confirmation of a bias on my part. I happen to be somebody who believes that, when the final history of the human race is written, professionalism will have turned out to be the worst disease of all. However understandable professionalism is in its origins, it tends to be parochial, exclusionary and self serving, and I don't care whether it is the medical profession, the psychological profession or the teaching profession. They are constantly making it more and more difficult to enter, raising more and more requirements, all in the rhetoric of the public welfare. I would like to suggest that we take a second look at that. What I am asking is if you have limited resources, and we are always dealing with limited resources, in what direction do you want to go? I am just impressed by how easily we tend to go in one direction. I am concerned that for the next twenty years, the problem that is going to be the most poignantly personal is that of professional burn out. It has already been recognized as a problem and, again, it is not peculiar to the field of education.

Dr. Nadler:

What does that mean in terms of how people operate in the universities? We tend to meet with the same faculty members, participate in the same meetings, with the same people, we have academic disciplines, there are camps. How does the place look that perpetuates your notions of direction?

Dr. Sarason:

I don't think it is any different in the university, I mean, by and large, maybe a little bit better than it is let's say in the school system. We once wrote a book and, to my amazement, there is one chapter in it to which the people responded. We got letters from all over; the chapter was entitled "Teaching is a Lonely Profession." It is just amazing that you are in, from a demographic standpoint, one of the most densely populated places on earth and yet, teachers feel alone. I don't think it is much different in the university.

How do you select people for entering a profession? If you know how to select you have licked 50% of the training problem. You are asking much too much of the university. It took me 25 years and, after having been in the university over 35 years, one day I had an "ah-ha" experience. I finally figured out what the thing was all about. You have got to ask two questions. One question is, who tries to make it in a university? The second question is, who does the university select? The answer to both questions is rugged individuals. So, you end up with a bunch of ambitious, assertive, primadonna

adequately schooled, self selected, passing through the rigor of the program, understanding the body of knowledge of the discipline, that person will be a self motivated person who will want to do well and want to keep current and want to function effectively within the school culture.

Dr. Sarason:

The way you put them, it is hard to disagree. What I get from teachers is that, unfortunately, the culture of the school doesn't lend itself to act appropriately on many of the things that they have been taught. You ask, for example, why is it if there is anything that is going to bug the beginning teacher, the student teacher certainly, it is the discipline problem. What is it? I mean, is it that children are inherently sadistic, impossible? Our tendency is always to project the blame outward and that usually has an element of truth because even paranoids have enemies. I don't think we examine carefully enough where we are hurting. Discipline is one thing and there are other aspects of it. I don't say that I have the answers to it because there is another part of me that argues that society just scapegoats the school. There isn't a problem in society that they don't ask the school to solve whether it is desegregation, whether it is premature pregnancy, whether it is dope, whether, you just name it and you give to the schools. Now, if I have any recommendations to make to school people, it would be for God's sake get up and shout out loud that there are limits to what the educational system can and should do, and we no longer take complete responsibility for these things. I do not hear the policy makers and I don't hear the people in the university saying, "Hey, no more!" You are asking us to do things that we are not equipped to do well. These are legitimate problems but to continue to pile problem after problem into the baliwick of the school is a mistake. If you want to do it, fine, but don't do it on the assumption that we know, better than you, how to handle it. I mean, the kid who climbs the wall outside the school, climbs the wall inside the school, why should we do it any better than somebody outside? I think what schools, the educators, are suffering from is a long history in which they said to the community, "hey send us the kid. We will do our thing just stay the hell out of it." That is what we are suffering from. We did what other professions did. We said give us the resources and we will take care of it all. It never was true. The schools never had enough resources to resolve all the problems.

Dr. Hollander:

Let me suggest that part of the problem we face is constraint. The curricula, that we can develop, is constrained very directly and very specifically into the kinds of courses that are mandated to train teachers and I just don't believe it is desirable to do that. I think a more appropriate alternative is to permit the faculties at our institutions to establish the curricula in terms of broader goals. I want to get back to that very specific process because what we have in this state now, and I have to talk about what I know which is here, is a large number of certificates. I don't know whay we have so many certificates. I do know why we have so many certificates, it has nothing to do with education, it has to do with job security, I suspect. We have a large number of certificates and we have a board that tells our institutions - these are the courses that are required to meet those certificate requirements. I would argue that that in itself, if nothing else were present in this state, limits the initiative of our faculty to do something different.

In fact, I think one can make the case, and I think this group here would not support that case, that a better alternative to the one we now have is to simply say that anyone with baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution, or masters degree if that is the minimum level of education one thinks appropriate, should be permitted, based on the judgment of those who hire, to try their hands in teaching.

Dr. Sarason:

I just want to point out that there is one time in the history of society when all of this is not an issue, that is during war. It is during war time when we say - hey something has got to be done, it has got to be done soon. We develop instant professionalization. Now the fact is that you cannot understand current society unless you understand the innovativeness that was ingendered during World War II.

Dr. Nadler:

I would suggest that we are in a war right now, a war of shrinking resources. I think that is becoming more and more obvious and, I feel, that will generate the innovation and the creativeness and the cognitive skills that we have to make things better.

Dr. Sarason:

I just want to say one more thing, and this is, the situation could be much worse than it is. I could be in the Chancellor's position. Thank you.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

## CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Please circle the number per item that best indicates your opinion.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The objectives were: N=65 | Clear | Vague |
| | R 1-5, $\bar{x}$ = 2.5 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 2. | For my needs, the objectives were: N=64 | Appropriate | Unappropriate |
| | R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 2.2 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 3. | The presentations met the objectives: N=64 | Well | Poorly |
| | R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 2.4 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 4. | The ideas and information presented will be: N=65 | Helpful | Not Helpful |
| | R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 2.1 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 5. | The overall quality of the presentation was: N=66 | Excellent | Poor |
| | R 1-3, $\bar{x}$ = 1.9 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 6. | The organization and format of the workshop was: N=66 | Appropriate | Unappropriate |
| | R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 1.7 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 7. | My expectations were: N=61 | Clearly Met | Not Met |
| | R 1-5, $\bar{x}$ = 2.4 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 8. | The probability of my using the material presented: N=65 | Very likely | Unlikely |
| | R 1-5, $\bar{x}$ = 2.4 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 9. | The preliminary arrangements were: N=66 | Excellent | Poor |
| | R 1-3, $\bar{x}$ = 1.4 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |
| 10. | The staff were: N=65 | Very helpful | Not helpful |
| | R 1-3, $\bar{x}$ = 1.4 | 1 2 3 | 4 5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. The probability of my pursuing the subject matter presented further on my own is: N=63 | Very likely | | | | Unlikely |
| R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 2.0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Overall, I consider this experience to have been: N=65 | Excellent | | | Poor | |
| R 1-4, $\bar{x}$ = 1.8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Strongest aspects were:

The opportunity for interaction and interchange of ideas among colleagues who do not often gather together. The presentations by Drs. Hollander and Sarason and the observer's fishbowl were seen as positive and enlightening.

Weakest aspects were:

Responses suggested that there was difficulty in the small groups. The difficulty was in two areas; the first was a lack of clarity and definition regarding the direction expected from participants in the small groups; the second was the personal hidden agendas and defensiveness which participants brought to the discussions. There were some negative reactions regarding the vagueness of the fishbowl participated in by the group recorders. The lack of time for participants to respond to the fishbowls was, also, cited as a weakness.

The primary factor that motivated me to attend:

Participants suggested the following as reasons for attendance: desire for change; exploration of potential areas of movement; committment to and concern for higher education; the presence of Drs. Sarason and Hollander; the chance to interact with peers; and interest in Project Update.

Suggestions:

The major suggestion was to consider the Fall Conference as a preliminary step. Many participants asked for continuing conferences with narrower and clearer foci. It was suggested that such conferences be geared toward continuing action and positive change. Two other common suggestions were more participant involvement during the common sessions and prior dissemination of information enabling participants to more clearly identify goals prior to the meeting.

Post Meeting Reactions:

Dr. Sarason

Reactions to Seymour Sarason's presentations were generally positive. There was some suggestion of vagueness, especially early in his presentation. Final remarks made by Dr. Sarason were reviewed as inspiring.

Dr. Hollander

Many of the reactions to T. Edward Hollander were positive. There were comments that he was interesting and informative. On the negative side, there were opinions that Dr. Hollander's presentations were close-minded and overly bureaucratic.

Fishbowls

Fishbowl I, participated in by small group recorders, was seen as not reflective of the discussions within the groups. Fishbowl II, participated in by conference observers, was viewed as useful and interesting. More time could have been dedicated to the second fishbowl. A drawback in the fishbowl segment was that the audience was given no time to react.

General Conference Reactions:

The theme and goals of the conference were seen as vague. Most respondents, however, viewed this conference as a constructive initial step and are looking forward to action oriented follow-ups. While many participants welcomed the opportunity to interact with professional peers, some felt that the resulting communication was somewhat stilted. More time could have been allowed for the affective realm of the process. The conference was seen as a useful learning experience.

## Acknowledgements

On behalf of Project Update, we wish to express sincere appreciation to the conference keynote speakers, Dr. Seymour Sarason, Dr. T. Edward Hollander; reactors, Dr. Grace Bingham, Dr. Mark Chamberlain, Dr. George H. Daniel, Miss Marianne Schmieder, Dr. Bruce Waldman, and the Honorable Charles B. Yates; facilitators, Dr. Patricia Brady, Dr. Spencer Gibbins, Mr. Charles Lagos, Dr. Myrna Merron, Dr. James Richardson, and Dr. Kenneth Schneider; group representatives, Mr. Tom Brown, Dr. John Callan, Mr. Jeff Pollack, Dr. Hal Scholl, Dr. Milton Schwebel and Dr. George Westmoreland

Special thanks are extended to Cheryl Whiting for preparing the conference materials and Dennis Connors and Ellen Maney for their assistance during the conference. Finally, we express our gratitude to Dr. Paul Winkler for his encouragement and support of Project Update and this conference.

Project Update Staff

# PROJECT UPDATE

**PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:**

Mae Balaban, Ed.D.
*Montclair State College*

Nickie Berson, Ed.D.
*Kean College of New Jersey*

Rita Fass, Ed.D.
*Fairleigh Dickinson University*

Spencer Gibbons, Ph.D.
*GSE, Rutgers*

Diane E. Haines, M.Ed.
*Trenton State College*

Catherine Hamalian, Ed.D.
*Jersey City State College*

Yetta Levine, M.A.
*Middlesex County College*

Jerome Margolis, M.A.
*Monmouth College*

Myrna Merron, Ed.D.
*Seton Hall University*

Maryann Peins, Ph.D.
*Douglass College*

Kenneth Schneider, Ph.D.
*GSAPP, Rutgers*

Rita Silverman, Ph.D.
*Rutgers College*

Berminna Solem, M.A.
*Gloucester County College*

Louis Stoia, Ed.D.
*William Paterson College*

Mary Ann Vanderveer, M.A.
*Georgian Court College*

Sr. Annelle Velivis, M.S.
*Felician College*

PROJECT UPDATE is a program of continuing professional development for faculty members in special education at institutions of higher learning in the State of New Jersey. The project represents a collaborative effort between the member institutions of the Higher Education Council in Special Education and the State Department of Education. Project activities are funded through a grant award from the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education.

The intent of Project Update is to maximize the potential for service to the handicapped by encouraging and supporting institutions of Higher Education in their endeavor to provide programs and services appropriate to the personnel needs identified in the State's Annual Program Plan for Special Education. The activities of Project Update are designed to -

1. **Assist special education faculty members in responding to the State's special education personnel needs.**
2. **Develop the awareness of the special education faculty for the personnel needs in the state.**
3. **Support special education faculty who participate in continuing education programs designed to enhance their skills in delivering needed services.**
4. **Encourage college faculty who design and implement programs reflective of the personnel needs in the state.**
5. **Stimulate special education faculty members in their pursuit of scholarly achievement.**
6. **Disseminate information and provide learning experiences which will result in special education faculty who are more knowledgeable of current trends and issues in special education for exceptional individuals.**
7. **Serve college faculty who conduct applied research that is relevant to current needs in the field of special education as identified in the state plan.**

Each academic year, priority areas of study are identified through a needs assessment interview process conducted at institutions of higher education. Goals established by the New Jersey State Department of Education are used as guidelines to validate the final selection of priority areas of study. The project is assisted in its operation by the Personnel Development Committee of the Higher Education Council. This committee acts in an advisory capacity providing a vital communication link between the project staff and individual college/university faculty members. It also assists in the determination of the projects' overall direction. In fulfilling its objectives Project Update incorporates a variety of inservice formats. These formats include state-wide conferences, study institutes and individually initiated activity.

-Two state-wide conferences are held during the acadmic year. These conferences involve nationally recognized leaders in the field. Conference topics represent areas of general interest to higher education faculty members in special education.
-Study institutes provide opportunities for faculty members to pursue extensive, ongoing group exploration in a variety of topical areas.
-Individually intitiated study opportunities are available to faculty members who participate in inservice activities sponsored by the project. This option is designed to enhance the effectiveness of project efforts by encouraging individual faculty members to pursue and share indepth study in a designated area of interest. Applications can be requested from the project office from September through April 30.

**Project Staff:**
**William K. Friedel**
Project Director
**Barbara Nadler, Ed. D.**
Project Coordinator
**Stephen J. Kiernan**
Doctoral Intern

*- A New Jersey State Department of Education program in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped*

For further details concerning these programs, please contact -
**PROJECT UPDATE**
**168 BANK STREET**
**HIGHTSTOWN, N.J. 08520**
**609-448-0932**